# REVIEW FOR APPLICABILITY OF/COMPLIANCE WITH **ORDINANCES/POLICIES**

## FOR PURPOSES OF CONSIDERATION OF **Howland TPM, TPM 21118**

**February 8, 2011** 

| <u>I. HABITAT LOSS PERMIT ORDINANCE</u> – Does the proposed project conform to the Habitat Loss Permit/Coastal Sage Scrub Ordinance findings?  |                  |                |               |   |  |  |  |
|--|------------------|----------------|---------------|---|--|--|--|
|  | YES              | NO             | NOT APPI<br>⊠ | LICABLE/EXEMPT  |  |  |  |
| Discussion:  |                  |                |               |   |  |  |  |
| The proposed project and any off-site improvements are located within the boundaries of the Multiple Species Conservation Program. Therefore, conformance to the Habitat Loss Permit/Coastal Sage Scrub Ordinance findings is not required.  |                  |                |               |   |  |  |  |
| <u>II. MSCP/BMO</u> - Does the proposed project conform to the Multiple Species Conservation Program and Biological Mitigation Ordinance?  |                  |                |               |   |  |  |  |
| Υ  | ∕ES NO<br>⊠      | O NO           | OT APPLICA    | BLE/EXEMPT  |  |  |  |
| The proposed project and any off-site improvements related to the proposed project are within the boundaries of the Multiple Species Conservation Program. The project conforms with the Multiple Species Conservation Program and the Biological Mitigation Ordinance as discussed in the MSCP Findings dated December 2, 2008. |                  |                |               |   |  |  |  |
| <u>III. GROUNDWATER ORDINANCE</u> - Does the project comply with the requirements of the San Diego County Groundwater Ordinance?   |                  |                |               |   |  |  |  |
|  | YES              | NO             | NOT APPI<br>⊠ | LICABLE/EXEMPT  |  |  |  |
| Discussion:  |                  |                |               |   |  |  |  |
|  | ce reservoirs ar | nd/or imported | sources. TI   | Water District which obtains ne project will not use any stic supply. |  |  |  |

**IV. RESOURCE PROTECTION ORDINANCE** - Does the project comply with:

TPM 21118 - 2 - 2/8/11

| (Sections 86.604(a) and (b)) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?   |          |    |                       |
|--|----------|----|-----------------------|
| The Floodways and Floodplain Fringe section (Sections 86.604(c) and (d)) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?   | YES      | NO | NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT |
| The Steep Slope section (Section 86.604(e))?   | YES      | NO | NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT |
| The Sensitive Habitat Lands section (Section 86.604(f)) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?                    | YES<br>⊠ | NO | NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT |
| The Significant Prehistoric and Historic Sites section (Section 86.604(g)) of the Resource Protection Ordinance? | YES<br>⊠ | NO | NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT |

#### Discussion:

#### Wetland and Wetland Buffers:

The area adjacent to the site to the east contains a drainage with southern riparian scrub, which if disturbed would result in a significant impact. Although the wetland itself is located off-site, the part of the site within 50 feet of the wetland will be placed in an open space easement prior to issuance of improvement or grading plans or prior to recordation of the Parcel Map, whichever comes first. This wetland buffer open space will be surrounded by a 90 foot Limited Building Zone, which the local fire chief has determined is accurate for fuel management. The open space will also be protected with temporary fencing and permanent signage. There will be no net loss of wetlands and therefore no significant impact will occur. Therefore, it has been found that the proposed project complies with Sections 86.604(a) and (b) of the Resource Protection Ordinance.

### Floodways and Floodplain Fringe:

The project is not located adjacent to any floodway/floodplain fringe area as defined in the resource protection ordinance, nor is it located adjacent to any watercourse which is plotted on any official County floodway/floodplain map. The project is in conformance with the RPO.

### Steep Slopes:

Slopes with a gradient of 25 percent or greater and 50 feet or higher in vertical height are required to be placed in open space easements by the San Diego County Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO). There are no steep slopes on the property. The project is in conformance with the RPO.

#### Sensitive Habitats:

No sensitive habitat lands were identified on the site as determined on a site visit conducted by Beth Ehsan on February 21, 2008. Therefore, it has been found that the proposed project complies with Section 86.604(f) of the RPO.

## Significant Prehistoric and Historic Sites:

The property has been surveyed by County of San Diego archaeologist Diane Shalom on March 27, 2008 and it has been determined that the property does not contain any archaeological/ historical sites. In addition, the project must comply with the San Diego County Grading, Clearing, and Watercourse Ordinance (§87.101-87.804), CEQA §15064.5(d), and §7050.5 of the Health & Safety Code. Section 87.429 of the Grading, Clearance, and Watercourse Ordinance requires the suspension of grading operations when human remains or Native American artifacts are encountered.

| Wilch Haman Tolli | anis or riali | ve / tillelleall | artifacts are effectiveled.                             |  |
|-------------------|---------------|------------------|---|--|
|                   | shed Protec   |                  | - Does the project comply ater Management and Disc      |  |
|                   | YES           | NO               | NOT APPLICABLE  |  |
| Discussion:       |               |                  |   |  |
|                   |               | •                | lan, received on October in compliance with the WP      |  |
|                   |               |                  | ect comply with the County<br>e County of San Diego Noi |  |
|                   | YES           | NO               | NOT APPLICABLE  |  |
| Discussion:       |               |                  |   |  |

The proposal would not expose people to nor generate potentially significant noise levels which exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control regulations.

Transportation (traffic, railroad, aircraft) noise levels at the project site are not expected to exceed Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL)=60 decibels (dB) limit because review of the project indicates that the project is not in close proximity to a railroad and/or airport. Additionally, the County of San Diego GIS noise model does not indicate that the project would be subject to potential excessive noise levels from circulation element roads either now or at General Plan buildout.